

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

## PORTLAND DIVISION

**MENTOR GRAPHICS CORPORATION,**  
an Oregon Corporation,

Plaintiffs and Counter-Defendant,

v.

**EVE-USA, INC.,** a Delaware corporation,  
and **SYNOPSIS EMULATION AND  
VERIFICATION S.A.,** formed under the  
laws of France,

Defendants and Counter-Claimants.

Case No. 3:10-cv-00954-MO (Lead)

Case No. 3:12-cv-01500-MO

Case No. 3:13-cv-00579-MO

**VERDICT FORM****VERDICT FORM**

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this Court as our verdict in this case.

**FINDINGS ON INFRINGEMENT CLAIMS****I. Flexible Probes****A. Direct Infringement**

1. Has Mentor Graphics proven that it is more likely than not that Synopsys' use, sale, or importation of emulators using flexible probes infringes one or more asserted claims of the Mentor Graphics patent?

Claim	Verdict on direct infringement
1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
28	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no

**B. Inducing Infringement**

2. Has Mentor Graphics proven that it is more likely than not that Synopsys induced infringement of one or more claims of the Mentor Graphics patent through Synopsys' use, sale, or importation of emulators using flexible probes?

Claim	Verdict on induced infringement
1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
28	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no

**C. Contributory Infringement**

3. Has Mentor Graphics proven that it is more likely than not that Synopsys contributed to the infringement of one or more claims of the Mentor Graphics patent Synopsys' use, sale, or importation of emulators using flexible probes?

Claim	Verdict on contributory infringement
1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
28	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no

**II. Value Change Probes****A. Direct Infringement**

4. Has Mentor Graphics proven that it is more likely than not that Synopsys' use, sale, or importation of emulators using value change probes infringes one or more asserted claims of the Mentor Graphics patent?

Claim	Verdict on direct infringement
1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
28	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no

**B. Inducing Infringement**

5. Has Mentor Graphics proven that it is more likely than not that Synopsys induced infringement of one or more claims of the Mentor Graphics patent through Synopsys' use, sale, or importation of emulators using value change probes?

Claim	Verdict on induced infringement
1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
28	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no

**C. Contributory Infringement**

6. Has Mentor Graphics proven that it is more likely than not that Synopsys contributed to the infringement of one or more claims of the Mentor Graphics patent through Synopsys' use, sale, or importation of emulators using value change probes?

Claim	Verdict on contributory infringement
1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
26	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
27	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
28	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no

**FINDINGS ON DAMAGES (IF APPLICABLE)**

If you answered question 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and/or 6 "yes," proceed to answer the remaining questions. If you did not so answer, do not answer the remaining questions and proceed to check and sign the verdict form.

4. What lost profits, if any, did Mentor Graphics show it more likely than not suffered as a result of sales that it would have made but for Synopsys' infringement?

\$ 36,417,666.00

5. For those infringing sales for which Mentor Graphics has not proved its entitlement to lost profits, what has it proved it is entitled to as a reasonable royalty:

a) royalty payment of 5 % of \$ 4,842,209.00 in total sales;

OR

b) one-time payment of \$ \_\_\_\_\_

You have now reached the end of the verdict form and should review it to ensure it accurately reflects your unanimous determinations. The Presiding Juror should then sign and date the verdict form in the spaces below and notify the Security Guard that you have reached a verdict. The Presiding Juror should retain possession of the verdict form and bring it when the jury is brought back into the courtroom.

DATED: October 10, 2014

By: [REDACTED]  
Presiding Juror